PTO/SB/21 (03-03)

Approved for use through 04/30/2003. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. Application Number 09/312,740 ERANSMITTAL Filing Date 5/14/1999 **FORM** First Named Inventor Douglas F. Beaven SEP 2 6 2005 Art Unit 3623 orrespondence after initial filing) **Examiner Name** Heck, Michael C. Total Number of Pages in This Submission Attorney Docket Number 14 beaven01.001 **ENCLOSURES** (Check all that apply) After Allowance Communication Fee Transmittal Form Drawing(s) to Group Appeal Communication to Board Licensing-related Papers Fee Attached of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to Group ✓ Petition (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Amendment/Reply Petition to Convert to a Proprietary Information After Final **Provisional Application** Power of Attorney, Revocation Status Letter Change of Correspondence Address Affidavits/declaration(s) Other Enclosure(s) (please Terminal Disclaimer Extension of Time Request Identify below): Return Postcard Request for Refund Express Abandonment Request CD, Number of CD(s) Information Disclosure Statement Remarks Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) Response to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Response to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Gordon E. Nelson #30,093 Individual Signature Date 9/22/2005 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231 on this date: 9/22/2005 Typed or printed Gordon E. Nelson 9/22/2005 Date Signature

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20231. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND 10:—Commissioner for Patents, Washington, DC 20231.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 (1-800-786-9199) and select option 2.



PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (beaven01.001)

5 Applicant:

Douglas F. Beaven

Paper No.:

Application No:

09/312,740

Group Art Unit: 2986

Filed:

5/14/99

Examiner: Heck, Michael

10

15

Title: Processing management information

Commissioner for Patents Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Response to final Office action under 37 C.F.R. 1.116

Summary of the prosecution

20 A RCE was filed on 30 August 2004 in the above application in response to a final rejection mailed 27 May 2004 in which Examiner responded to Applicant's substantial amendment of his claims in response to a non-final Office action by rejecting the amended claims on the basis of new references. The RCE included a traversal of those rejections. Examiner thereupon mailed a non-final Office action on 12/14/04 in which he 25 indicated that he found Applicant's traversal persuasive and in which he rejected pending claim 187 as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and rejected pending claims 187-210 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over the combination of two new references: Review Board, "High-end project managers", InfoWorld, Feb. 1, 1993, pp. 59-60, 62 -63, 66-69 (henceforth "Board") and Zimmerman, Leah V., 30 "Software review—Open Plan 5.0 Upgrade, Cost Engineering, Morgantown: Dec. 1993, vol. 35, Iss. 12, pg. 11 (henceforth "Zimmerman"). Applicant amended claim 187 to overcome one portion of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, traversed another portion thereof, and traversed the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103.

Examiner mailed a final Office action on 7/19/2005 in which he persisted in the second portion of his rejection of claim 187 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, persisted